DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 766 JC 980 237

AUTHOR Santa Rita, Emilio, Jr.
TITLE Classroom and Context: An Educational Dialectic.
PUB DATE 1996-00-00
NOTE 47p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *College Administration; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Conflict Resolution; Educational Objectives; Faculty College Relationship; Higher Education; Institutional Mission; Interpersonal Relationship; Interprofessional Relationship; Student Needs; *Student Personnel Services; *Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses some of the caveats that student affairs professionals and faculty members must take into account before forging a equal partnership in educating students. Each group must preserve its unique educational point of view, recognizing its identity and its worth. Student affairs people need not become more technically advanced. They must possess identifiable skills and be articulate representatives for higher education as a whole, asserting their identity in the institution. Faculty members need not become more managerial. They should be responsible and sensitive in working with their students and their course material. Faculty need to recognize the legitimacy of non-faculty roles in today's complex colleges and universities, while student affairs administrators need to respect the faculty's specialized educational mission. (Contains 13 references.) (EMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 418 766

CLASSROOM AND CONTEXT: AN EDUCATIONAL DIALECTIC

EMILIO D. SANTA RITA, JR.

BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Of The City University of New York
Department of Counseling & Student Support Services
1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Santa Rita

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JC 980 237

The scene is a Curriculum Committee meeting where the motion to approve a course for student retention has been "held hostage" for several months. No other course offered by the College has ever been subjected to such intense scrutiny. Faculty found the statistics presented for course efficacy to be "inadequate." The students' testimonials were deemed "rigged" and the input of the counselors conducting the course was "emotional" and not grounded on empirical evidence. Finally, the Committee decides to end the harrowing ordeal by voting against the course, concluding that, "Counselors should stay out of the classroom and wait in their offices to work with the students who are referred to them!"

Change of scene. A student comes to a counselor, distraught over what a faculty instructor just told her. The student wanted to discuss with the counselor her decision to drop a course. The faculty instructor tells the student, "You are wasting your time; Counselors are idiots!"

The Dean of Students is discussing an upcoming budget presentation with the Dean of Academic Affairs. They agree that more career counseling is needed for undergraduates, especially for the increasing number of undecided students. But the faculty bargaining unit is pushing for more tenure lines in engineering. The Dean of Students rehearses the arguments for adding two career counselor slots to the student affairs budget. Among other points, he states that life planning is as educationally valuable for students as some of the basic courses in the curriculum. The Dean of Academic Affairs looks uncomfortable. "You'd better leave that out," he says. "It won't fly."

The line of reasoning used in these cases is all too familiar. People in student affairs, knowing that education is, after all, the mission of

their institutions, justify their activities as educational. Yet the more they do this, the less often they convince their faculty colleagues. A persistent gap seems to exist between the two groups of people on campus who work most closely with students. The faculty/student affairs separation is a pervasive one throughout the college and university structure. It is felt by everyone from groundskeeper to president. The fact that a modern university consists of more than just faculty and students is often ignored. But one might think that professionals in the student affairs area would be in a privileged position in relation to faculty and that a common focus on students would be grounds for mutual understanding. Alas, not so. On some campuses, the separation between student affairs professionals - even those who also teach - and the full-time teaching faculty is open and rancorous, on other campuses, attempts are made to hide it. Either way, conflicts are there.

In order to survive the millenium, our institutions certainly need the collegiality which is at the origin of the word "college" and the unity which is at the origin of the word "university," even if such a recall to linguistic fundamentalism evokes a sad smile from us. Student affairs is here to stay on our campus. The positions of Director of Admissions, Financial Aid Officer, Director of Counseling, and so forth, each require specific expertise today. They are less and less likely to be filled by people who teach at the same time or who, in fact, have ever taught. For the sake of unity, survival, and the quality of the educational experience we offer our students, we need to look at what really does justify the existence of student affairs as an area of endeavor on campus, and why,instead of minimizing the gap between faculty members and student

affairs, we may want actually to reinforce our distinctiveness as a source of collaboration.

The issues are hard to pin down, and tend to have sensitive personal reverberations. To bring them out into the open, states of affairs will be polarized here which are never so clearly opposite in real life. The point is not to be definitive, but to provoke discussion from a new perspective.

Classroom and Context

What are the distinctive features of curricular and co-curricular life? In what sense does each contribute to learning? First, it is necessary to state a basic truth that is sometimes obscured: in a college or university, the formal curriculum is the reason the students are there. Interaction between student and instructor, i.e.,the "classroom," even when it is not physically a place, is central. What goes on outside of class--the context for the classroom experience--is also part of the student's educational immersion, but of itself it is not what makes the university a university rather than some other social institution. It may contribute greatly to the student's education, but not in the same way as does a formal curriculum. Student activities, and various forms of counseling and advising, involve services which could, in fact, be offered to any group of people gathered for any purpose: social, religious, recreational, or whatever. It is the formal learning embodied in the curriculum which differentiates the campus community as an institution of higher education from a commune, a church, a club, a camp, or a safari.

A good student affairs program is planned; it does not just happen. It is planned so as to be intensively educational and to integrate its

offerings closely with the curricular goals of the institution. But the nature of the learning it promotes is in several ways different from that of the classroom. There is a complementarity involved which is worth exploring.

To make this clear, let us look first at the formal learning situation. Practically anything can go on as a classroom activity and often does. There is no boundary beyond which one can say with assurance that something is not a classroom activity, just as one cannot limit the range of what is assigned to the student government offices or the student association rooms. But, in the case of the classroom, one sort of activity must occur in order for the situation truly to be called formal learning. Formal learning is directed in the end toward manipulating concepts rather than things. Why not just call that thinking? The word "thinking," like the word "education," is too general. Only certain kinds of thinking are referred to here. The thrust of formal learning is toward establishing systematic links from the particular to the general, from the concrete to the abstract, from the personal to the objective. Obviously, both induction and deduction are used in the classroom, but good teaching tends to start from where the student is: particular, concrete, individual. Thus the characteristic movement of formal education, whether in kindergarten or in postdoctoral seminars, is from known, assimilated (i.e., subjectified) experience toward a new level of objectivity (even in ethical and esthetic matters) and toward the abstraction of general truth and principles (Light, 1992).

As an example, students in a course in economics may be asked to look at the use of oil for heating by local home owners and business firms.

This provides an immediate, concrete kind of problem. But the reason for studying it is not to get to know the community better or to understand why one family likes its house warmer than another, but to be able to make some useful generalizations about how people's behavior changes in response to changes in price and market conditions. What the instructor expects students to come out with are concepts and principles which can be applied to other instances and to larger economic problems.

The other distinctive characteristic of formal learning is its artificial ordering of experience, the more ordered the better. In teaching a foreign language, one may start by exposing students to large chunks of the language as it is, but, very quickly, one begins to pull out examples which illustrate common tendencies, like the endings of verbs or the position of adjectives, so that the students can leap ahead of where they would be if everything had to be absorbed in its unordered form of everyday experience. In the classroom, if the facts are not at some point ordered, and if one does not learn to understand and manipulate concepts which can be applied beyond the immediate material presented, it would be hard to say that formal learning has occurred.

The same movement toward concepts and general principles goes on outside the classroom; it is not limited to the curriculum. It is always exciting to see how students' ability to order material and abstract from it on their own increases as they become more and more their own mentors. The point is that whether or not such activity goes on in a given situation outside the classroom does not <u>define</u> the situation. It is the reason for being - the <u>sine qua non</u> - of formal learning; it is an error to try to make the process of <u>induction</u> and abstraction as the <u>raison'</u>

d'etre of other campus activities. The student affairs area, in particular, has an almost opposite thrust and justification.

The difference between campus life - as it may be shaped and directed by student affairs personnel - and everyday life outside the campus gates, is not as readily sensed as the difference between the classroom and everyday life. The same sorts of cultural, political, religious, and service activities seem to occur on campus or off, in a kind of organized confusion of intentions, and people's individual reasons for what they do are just as diverse. Is there anything educationally distinctive about the campus context?

If you think about it, campus life differs from ordinary life in the density and accessibility of the experiences offered during each term or semester. A good campus environment offers concentrated doses of experience, of a marvelous variety of kinds, all available quite freely to the members of the community. There are extraordinary opportunities for learning and growth, some of them formal, most of them informal. Within each semester or quarter, students have access to a quantity and variety of experiences which one would not usually encounter in years of routine home life. This can be true whether one is a undergraduate at seventeen or at seventy. Co-curricular learning can perhaps best be thought of as a sort of intensified living. Through exposure to other students, through activities, information, counseling, part-time work, internships, and so on, the personal development of students is encouraged to keep pace with their intellectual development. What goes on in the classroom contributes to personal maturation too, but is not the reason for the classroom. The physics instructor does not teach the laws of thermodynamics to make

students more mature. But the personal, societal maturation of students is a concern of student affairs. It is, in fact, the primary educational concern of the Director of Counseling, the Dean of Student, and of the other counselors (Stroup, 1979).

The general direction of the learning process involved in "intensified living" follows that of our normal dealings with reality. It moves, in other words, from the general to the particular, the abstract to the concrete, the impersonal to the personal (Polyani, 1981). For example, we go to a lecture on campus safety and stop walking home alone at 1:00 A.M. from the library, or a counselor talks about the anguish many students feel while choosing their major and we are relieved to know that our own distress is not unique. The primary effort of counselors is directed (or should be) toward finding among the institution's options and restrictions a way for each individual student to develop to the fullest. This movement of bringing abstractions and principles down to a personal level is the opposite of what we observed as characteristic of formal learning.

The other defining element of the context in which most American undergraduate formal learning takes place, i.e., campus life, is the acceptability of transient commitment. One can attempt an activity or role on campus and then abandon it for another, usually without personal detriment in the world at large. The campus is a special kind of protected environment. Student activities offer a chance to try out the games of love and chance, of politics and power, of faith and even of health, apart from the main arena of life where they are played for keeps. This, by the way, is one of the attractions of the campus community for older adults who return to study at a later stage in their

lives. The opportunity is a useful one not only for those who are still making their first commitments and mistakes but also for men and women of every age who are making their individual odyssey through what Gail Sheehy (1976) has called life's passages.

There is further contrast between curricular and co-curricular emphases in learning which may sound like the reverse of what has just been outlined. It arises, nonetheless, out of the already stated characteristics of each area. In the classroom, although the immediate goal may be training in known skills and modes of thought, the eventual goal of even the most utilitarian of courses is to make people wary of stock answers and to bring them to the point where they deal creatively on their own with the material. This is especially true, or should be, of higher education. In this sense, higher education is fundamentally subversive. It brings people up to the edges of present knowledge in a field while training them to think independently. It thereby prepares the undermining of the accepted structures and ways of doing things--what the French call the "received ideas"--inherited from the past. The encouragement of independent thinking certainly adds yeast to the mix of our campus activities! On the other hand, students must work together, within commonly agreed-on structures, in order to carry out successful activities and create an enjoyable campus life. Thus, here is a sense in which, while the goal of formal learning is very individualistic, even idiosyncratic, the concern of a good student affairs program is to foster a cohesive, workable group existence. In all the various student services, one helps to set up structures and make them work. Of necessity, one is encouraging students to conform to institutional

structures, even as one is also finding ways of mitigating the effect of those structures on each student.

To summarize, formal learning moves to increase and order the student's conceptual knowledge in a way which can potentially lead to new insights and thereby to societal change. Co-curricular learning, on the other hand, is an intensification of the processes of learning by experience, encouraging personal development commensurate with intellectual sophistication. In contrast to the classroom's encouragement of individualized challenges to accepted ideas, the student affairs context fosters cooperative effort within the imposed structures of community living.

The danger of polarizing matters in the way we have just done is to make it appear that the content of what occurs in the classroom or outside the classroom is necessarily different, which it may not be at all. The material may be exactly the same. Let me suggest two illustrations. A director of student activities spends the morning meeting student leaders who are preparing a big political rally. They go over over strategies, publicity, transportation arrangements, and so on. In the late afternoon, the same director, teaching a graduate course in student personnel administration, uses the organization of the rally as one of the case studies. As you visualize what that person does in the first role as compared with the second, it is clear that the difference is not in the material but in the approach. Or take the professor of psychology who first teaches her course in counseling psychology and then goes to the college counseling office to counsel students. In both the course and the counseling office, one hopes that students are learning, from themselves

and from the psychologist, but the approach and the expectations will be different!

The generalizations we have made about the classroom and context are not limiting or exclusive; they are directed at approach, not content, and are only an attempt to discern tendencies. What is useful to us as faculty or as student affairs personnel is to realize the almost symmetrically opposite complementarity of our educational functions.

Attributes in Conflict

The preceding discussion on classroom and context makes it seem hardly surprising that different personalities tend to end up as professors as opposed to student affairs professionals. In caricature, the professorial extreme is almost the mirror image of the student affairs professional extreme. Of course there was a time in the evolution of many of the older colleges in this country when mentor and monitor were one and the same person. The faculty chose students, taught them, advised them, assisted them with financial or other problems, disciplined them, saw to their exposure to cultural events, and often found them a job at the conclusion of their studies. The twentieth century has brought us to such a degree of specialization that it is unlikely today that a person would be both a regular member of the teaching faculty and a staff member in student affairs. Where student affairs personnel are also faculty members, one finds that people tend to behave differently, even think differently, in their two roles.

In examining these two roles here, the traits will be purposely exaggerated for the sake of contrast. It is not that a different person is involved necessarily, but that each role tends to draw upon, and favor,

different aspects of personality. The matter is worth examining because of the pervasive difficulties faculty and student affairs personnel have in discussing professional concerns. Clearly, some emotionally charged personal factors are in the background.

The able professional in the student affairs domain has to enjoy students of every style and level of intellectual growth and has to respond to them as individuals whose entire lives are being reshaped by the educational commitment they have made. The student affairs professional is drawn to the subjective, experiential side of things, toward immediate problems and events which are important in their particularity. One has to be both practical and gregarious, knowing how to accomplish things <u>through</u> others, often in groups. On a rhythm of daily interactions, one has to take pleasure in organizing and orchestrating the ephemeral. Two approaches are important in most student affairs positions: one may be primarily a counselor, as in personal or career development counseling, or one may be primarily an administrator. Let us note in passing that faculty members are not primarily either of these. The educational role of a student affairs person is important but it does not, by itself, define one's position as a financial aid counselor, a foreign student advisor, a general counselor, or whatever. For the chief student affairs administrator, management ability is the key attribute. One must enjoy coordinating and managing events and people. This is very different from the scholarly mode. One study of a variety of managers, from foremen to hockey coaches to prime ministers, shows that while the folklore would have us believe that the manager is a reflective, systematic planner, the fact is that managers do more reacting than

acting. Managerial activities are characterized by "brevity, variety, and discontinuity," and managers tend to be action-oriented people who "dislike reflective activities" (Mintsberg, 1975. p. 50).

The committed and inspiring faculty member, on the other hand, is expected to have a primary orientation to ideas and reflection, to work with books or experiments or schema, prizing the objective view, reason and proof, detached judgment, originality, esthetic sensibility, exactitude. Social relationships can legitimately be sublimated and forgotten in the exciting pursuit of understanding. The high points of teaching - the "epiphanies," to use James Joyce's (1976) term - come when both instructor and students utterly forget themselves and their surroundings in the intensity of their engagement with ideas. The kinds of people who get caught up in teaching - and in the research and writing which back up the best teaching in any field - are allowed by society at large to remain somewhat apart and ill-adapted if they so choose. A professor can - without harm to professional standing - be shy, withdrawn, not good at handling practical matters, arrogant, self-centered, a loner, a less than active citizen, a sort of social misfit. Most faculty are not that way, but the option is open. Since the dominant American scene is anti-intellectual, as Richard Hofstadter (1983) made clear to us years ago, often the only place where the professor enjoys full prestige and honor is within the university.

Clearly, the personality tendencies we have sketched can be a source of conflict between student affairs personnel and faculty. It would be nice if the differences had stimulated constructive dialogue between equals. What has occurred so far on many campuses, unfortunately, is a

curious sort of mutual "put-down" at a personal level, leading to mutual avoidance, or worse. One finds people using defensive strategies of ridicule or the erection of barriers of language and style. Exacerbating the situation is what can be called the "power problem." Actual power, perceived power, and powerlessness exist on both sides. Bringing some of these usually avoided sore points into the open can perhaps help our understanding.

In the roles that they play, both the faculty member and the student affairs professional are vulnerable to feelings of inferiority which the person in the other role is especially likely to provoke. Consequently, each may feel strongly threatened, i.e., "put down," by the other. Successful faculty members are on their own "turf" within the campus confines. As noted earlier, the campus is the place - and it may be the only place - where being an intellectual pays off in terms of status and prestige. Outside the university, in society at large, the same people may be on the defensive, hassled by car salesmen, head waiters, and real estate brokers who would not think of so mistreating the local banker or business person. On campus, professors want full sway, with all the respect and honor which their personal styles may not call forth elsewhere.

The student affairs professional, on the other hand, is likely to be a "manager" type; enterpreneurial, gregarious, practical, at ease socially; in other words, exactly the kind of person from whom the scholar may be trying to take refuge within the university. The epitome of the "manager" is legitimately installed as the Dean of Student Affairs ready to extend his or her social mastery and administrative expertise into the

professorial domain. There looms the very societal put-down which academics had hoped to elude, ready to shame them one more time.

The scholar's reaction of rage and horror is principled as well as personal. It is born out of the instinctive need to defend the territory of free thought and protect the prerogative of being nonconformist even to the point of turning the world on its ear. The Dean of Student Affairs and his or her staff are expected to see that the institution thrives by "running well." "Running well" is apt to mean a strong administrative structure that maintains control over student behavior in class as well as outside of class. The faculty member, however, knows the importance of encouraging criticism of the status quo. The tension is a familiar one, mentioned in our discussion of classroom and context, between established social structures which tend to resist change and the mission of higher education not only to preserve and transmit knowledge but to renew it and thereby promote change. The faculty member is torn between encouraging criticism and free inquiry while maintaining a semblance of structure to guide that inquiry. In an effort to maintain the self-image of the maverick, most faculty fashion a psychic compromise. Faculty split-off the disliked role of limit-setting and delegate to their despised counterpart, the student affairs professional, the power to control and manage student behavior. Student affairs professionals, as a rule, receive this "mandate" with resentment because they perceive themselves as advocates for students, not disciplinarians or authority figures that students rebel against. The struggle which goes on is an important one, between the Dionysian and Apollonian forces, if you will, for it indeed has assumed epic proportions, as in the student riots of the Vietnam War

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

era. In that era, the college presidents used the deans of students as their "fall guy" to carry out unpopular decisions. By seeming to have made the decision themselves, the Deans of Students saved the presidents from student's criticisms or resentment and enabled the presidents to exercise authority without personal accountability. As a general rule, faculty expect students to be inquisitive, social activists, and political leaders. But when students presume to question the relevance of courses or criticize methods of teaching, faculty members become frantic and demand that student affairs people discipline and deliver a chastened student to the classroom in the best possible receptive condition for learning what the professors are ready to impart.

Student affairs professionals must walk a fine line between too much structure and not enough. Concern for efficient functioning must not be such as to rule out of existence the student who wants to follow curiosity wherever it leads, since the campus is supposed to be society's haven for such a person. Actually, the student affairs person who is a limit-setter allows the professor to be a maverick and the "good cop-bad cop" arrangement can serve as a check-and-balance mechanism to inquiry and learning on campus. But one can see why the faculty member may unconsciously find the well-trained and effective student affairs person threatening. He or she might use the "bad cop" role to discipline the student; or, may side with the student to criticize the faculty member.

Turning to the student affairs person, what do we find? All too often we find someone who is well-educated, sympathetic to the cause of higher education, supportive of its mission, gifted in the ability to mediate the problems people face in an intellectual community, yet dogged by a sense

of outrage and frustration and not having the respect accorded to other professionals. Even acquiring a doctorate in student personnel administration, psychology, or social work does not confer academic credibility and respect to the student affairs professional. Faculty continue to perceive the espoused goals of student affairs work (i.e. student's personal development) to be superfluous when compared with the core activities (teaching and research) of the academic enterprise. And yet there is little time to do research and writing as planned by the student affairs professional. "Research" has been reduced to the gathering of information needed to help both students and faculty, and the writing has consisted primarily of doing reports, memos, and revising informational handouts and brochures. How can student affairs professionals justify taking time to write articles when there are so many student problems needing attention? Can they teach themselves to move out of the 9-to-5 syndrome? Are they willing to do the research and writing after office hours and not resent faculty members who do not stay in their offices except for scheduled appointments? Faculty are usually trained skeptics, to whom a person doing research in student personnel work may seem intellectually gullible. Because of the very difficulty of conducting rigorous analysis in such a field, researchers must prove themselves individually. They are not likely to be accepted automatically into the scholarly fold. For the student affairs person whose inclinations are more toward action than scholarship, being a bad scholar leads neither to faculty acceptance nor to the best service to the institution. And so, out of defensiveness, they criticize and mock faculty where they are most exposed and vulnerable--their pedagogical shortcomings, as reported by

students every time they drop a course. And student affairs personnel sometimes do commiserate with the students. This is just what faculty fear that the student affairs professionals will do. The mutual "put-down" comes full circle.

But there is more to the matter. Society refers to the scientist with a capital "S" in a rather obsequious way. At the heart of the "Scientist with a capital 'S'" issue is the fact that scientists usually learn something of literature, history, philosophy, and the arts in the course of becoming scientists whereas humanists--and the rest of us--do not necessarily learn much science. This makes science more mysterious to the nonscientists than humanism is to the scientist. Similarly, teaching and research has appropriated to itself the status of the faculty with a capital "F." Like the scientist, faculty members somewhere along the way, have had to acquire some understanding of students' program planning ability, psychology, the behavioral sciences, and so forth. While student affairs people may hesitate to intrude on the faculty world, faculty move in and out of the student affairs domain at will, however lacking in particular expertise they may be. When students are unhappy in the classroom or there is a security incident during freshman orientation, faculty will claim authority, from their central position with respect to the educational mission of the institution, to criticize the handling of the matter and propose solutions, sometimes without even consulting the student personnel experts.

Using the term "expert" brings up another part of the problem. To what extent is a student affairs professional an expert, a <u>professional</u>, in student affairs? There is a readily identified content and set of

professional skills associated with being a university psychiatrist, a college chaplain, or a football coach. Such jobs require a specialized apprenticeship and some form of certification by peers. But one may move into the position of Dean of Students, or Director of Student Activities from a variety of backgrounds, and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs of a university system may be someone with a J.D., or an M.B.A., or a Ph.D. in classics, just as well as someone with a doctorate in student personnel administration.

Some of the paragons of institutional excellence, such as the Ivy League colleges and other elite liberal arts institutions, employ few professionally prepared student affairs staff members which implies that expertise may be unnecessary. Also, many institutions continue to fill student affairs positions with recent alumni whose credentials, in terms of academic or professional preparation, do not compare favorably with those presented by the faculty. Thus, in many institutions, a negative role model may operate that detracts from the credibility and centrality of student affairs work. There is a sense, for example, in which any dean, or provost, or president of an institution is not a professional at all. The person takes on a managerial role and thereby moves out from his or her original professional field to become a generalist. Even professional certification in nonprofit business administration is not, in itself, sufficient to meet the broad demands of a top administrative position. Generalists are extremely valuable amidst the specializing tendencies of a college or university. They deserve respect for the executive and managerial competence they demonstrate. But, strictly speaking, they are professionals by virtue of the field through which they

reach their position, not by the position itself.

In the area of student affairs--and what a broad and varied area it can be--confusion is easy between expert and executive. In contrast, the professionalism of faculty is sharply delineated, far more so today than in the days when university contracts stated that a professor could be called on by the trustees to teach any subject! Once again, we can see that student affairs people and faculty tend toward two ends of the spectrum, and, therefore, it is not surprising that misunderstandings about professionalism result. The best solution is not to claim professional standing, but to show it. Where there are opportunities for the Director of the Student Activities or the Director of Career Services to demonstrate to faculty colleagues the importance of new techniques and new bodies of knowledge, as well as his or her ability to contribute to what faculty are trying to accomplish, arguments about professionalism die away. For all the contention that any faculty member can "do" student affairs with the left hand while teaching with the right, few instructors really want to try, especially with the other pressures that are on them today. But it is reasonable for faculty to expect specific knowledge and skills from student affairs professionals and to be able to feel that such skills are being used well.

Various forms of defensiveness arise out of the anxieties which faculty and student affairs personnel provoke in one another by the fact that the areas of strength of the one are so often areas of weakness in the other. The administrator may try to become the scholar he or she basically is not. The faculty member may try unhappily to play the manager's role and may give up all efforts to reach out to students beyond

the classroom. Pretense, the use of jargon, and withdrawal into a distant superiority are among the unfortunate responses that occur.

Nothing seems to upset faculty from the traditional disciplines more acutely than the vocabulary used in the domain of student affairs. The mixture of terms borrowed from management theory and the behavioral sciences, not always applied precisely, disturbs both those who do not understand and those who fear that they may understand too well. The jargon is viewed as a pretentious smokescreen hiding either superficiality or, far worse, a veritable monster of human control mechanisms. From the faculty member's point of view, too many people in student affairs are too easily taken in by techniques of applied psychology and computer technology. The tendency to identify student affairs work with psychotherapy has been one reason for the alienation of student affairs personnel from the faculty. Too many student affairs professionals act like frustrated psychotherapists or like psychiatric technicians. A counselor once said that the therapeutic approach to counseling has led student affairs people to forget that they operate in an educational institution and to act as if they were responsible for the hospital care of students. Personality problems, of course, are inherently interesting, and one can easily understand why student affairs professionals want to be clinicians, but it has been long suspected that there is another reason for such widespread interest in psychotherapy. Some observers feel that many people go into counseling because they themselves have personal problems, that they project their own problems into the lives of students, and that they unconsciously try to work out their own conflicts by trying to help students resolve their difficulties. As they become more and more

engrossed in emotional problems, student affairs people find themselves increasingly marginal to the academic mission of their institution.

Faculty members can be superficial, too, and gullible, especially outside their own areas of expertise. One of the advantages of the Ph.D. is that it allows you to be naive and foolish in everything but your own discipline. Sometimes, there's a sort of down-curve from the B.A. on. A colleague of this author in the pastoral ministry once told him of some definitions which were circulating at Union Theological Seminary, where many students prepare for Bachelor of Divinity or Doctor of Divinity degrees: if you had earned the right to put the initials "B.D." after your name, they stood for Barely Dumb; "D.D." stood, alas, for Definitely Dumb; and "Ph.D."?--Phenomenally Dumb! To many worried Deans of Student Affairs today, in touch as they must be with student trends, a lot of faculty currently seem out of touch with the new style of TV-nourished students they are supposed to teach, lost in their own specialty, too concerned about tenure to teach properly or to carry a share of community burdens, or too secure in tenure to bother. Selfishness, aloofness, tunnel vision, and social insensitivity are all traits among the faculty which rouse the ire of those responsible for making the campus a good learning community for students. The faculty member who tries to move in and run student affairs can also be a problem. Authoritarian ways can lead to revolt, sincerity to indiscretion, and impulsiveness to serious inequities; meanwhile, the preparation of lectures is neglected and unreturned student papers lie around in stacks. Being a poor dean, or counselor, or registrar, or whatever, confers little administrative power and less advantage to the institution.

The mention of power brings us to the last aspect of conflict between the commonly seen characteristics of the faculty role and the student affairs role in higher education: the "power problem." A college or university is supposed, in theory, to be a company of scholars, a group of independent professionals banding together to offer instruction. Historically, educational administration has risen out of the faculty. The fact that most institutions today are barely collegial, and that administration has become an entity unto itself, does not affect the central position of the faculty in the operation. As stated earlier, the formal curriculum is the reason students are there. Thus, power would appear to rest with the faculty; they determine and teach the curriculum. But the financial base is clearly with the President and the college administration. In many institutions today, the administration around the president seems all-powerful and faculty members struggle to keep a share of control through limited participation in governance or through collective bargaining or both.

Facing this situation, student affairs professionals are in a curiously ambiguous position. They have less power and prestige than the faculty because they are a step removed from the formal learning process. On the other hand, the Dean of Students, representing student affairs personnel, is often the only university officer other than the President who has an "institution-wide" generalist view. Student affairs deans are chosen for their ability to encompass the institution in its physical arrangements and its human and intellectual dimensions as it affects all of its publics and are thus in a potentially powerful situation to see the larger picture and influence many actions. They are also advocates for

students and responsible for many quasi-legal matters related to students. Student concerns, when pervasive, have to become institutional concerns. In addition, student affairs people tend to "embody" the institution to the individual student as they interpret rules, explain procedures, and guide progress. They are usually more immediately accessible than faculty, and their views on educational philosophy may be particularly influential because they are offered outside the teacher/student relationship. Student polls show that students tend to know the student affairs personnel and to have stronger ties to them than to anyone but peers. Student affairs personnel also have potential power through the action of students. Some student affairs personnel can marshal an army of student supporters in a wink and, with their skill in organization and group dynamics, can control that army better than many faculty can handle a freshman laboratory section.

Instinctively, faculty recognize these elements of power in the student affairs situation and resent them. Student affairs personnel are seen as one and the same with the central administration of the institution against which the faculty struggles. From the viewpoint of student affairs, however, the juggernaut of faculty power is always poised to move in--and to leave student affairs out. A declining revenue base has made it more difficult than ever for institutions to address all desirable goals. In a financial crunch, when the situation calls for retrenchment, faculty, as a rule, vote for the abolition of student affairs. They argue that activities that are tangential to the academic mission of the college should be "deemphasized" in times of fiscal austerity. Student affairs people also watch faculty members become

increasingly isolated from one another and from students. They see the institution splitting into many fragments, yet they are unable to change the trend. Both faculty and student affairs personnel feel powerless and angered by their powerlessness.

Given the mutual fear, pretense, plays for power and the frustration which accompany them, it is not surprising that the faculty/student affairs relationship is full of friction. From our earlier discussion of characteristic attributes, we can see why there is a pervasive and enduring separation between the two kinds of role. Yet the frictions and the separations may not be a bad thing. In fact, the dialectic tension between the two areas could be a source of enrichment for college and university life. There can only be true dialogue between two equals, however. Both faculty and student affairs personnel need to affirm their roles and recognize the importance of the other group to the mission of higher education.

Complementarities

Let us now look at what could bring us together. What should we contribute positively to each other and to our institutions? First let us outline some faculty responsibilities and then those of student affairs personnel.

Change in Attitudes

Faculty members must be willing to cultivate the ability to look beyond their particular disciplines or departments and acquire a more holistic view of students and their colleges. Unfortunately, the exclusive allegiance of some academicians to their specific disciplines, rather than to an institution or even to students, is a barrier to the

cultivation of such openness. Faculty members must also be willing to establish partnerships with student affairs personnel, to work with various offices in a cooperative manner in order to become more aware of what is truly happening and to minimize unhealthy competition.

In addition, faculty members must be willing to understand some of the difficulties and complexities inherent in managing student affairs. Career counseling, job placement, financial aid, for example, are not "bread and circus" activities. They are essential services and often have special public relations problems that must be recognized and appreciated. Despite the best and most diligent of efforts, not all students can or will be satisfied.

Student affairs professionals, on the other hand, must be completely dedicated to performing their own work well and in an appropriately professional manner. Demonstrating competence and excellence is a compelling argument and an indispensable technique for building rapport. In addition, the student affairs professional needs a somewhat thick skin and a sense of personal worth and accomplishment, since student affairs will always be seen by some academicians as peripheral, at best, and even unnecessary. Defensiveness and/or an exaggerated emphasis on the importance of one's own turf is counterproductive and frequently leads to reciprocal hostility. Quiet and unobstrusive confidence and competence will bring their own reward.

Sometimes, student affairs providers may not be sensitive to the unique demands placed on faculty as they work within their departments and with students. With the increasing pressure on them from accountability-conscious administrators, a hostile public, and a

disillusioned student body wanting them to become more effective teachers, faculty are desperate for some understanding and assistance.

When cooperative attitudes are present, individuals are more able to reach out to others. Faculty and student affairs personnel can reach out to one another and form networks and alliances to further the total development of students. It becomes a question, then, not of competing but of reframing our cooperative efforts and being proactive enough to bring forth issues and ideas that will help the students and the institution. What Can We Do for Each Other and the Institution?

It follows from what we said earlier about the central mission of colleges and universities that the faculty should be accountable for the formal curriculum and, thereby, for the contribution which one particular college or university makes to the world's educational enterprise. Individual faculty or academic deans do not often have time to stand off from the details of their own courses, disciplines, and concerns to contemplate the whole. But they should. What is to be learned in this institution? What are the major questions being asked through the curriculum? To what extent does this curriculum ask questions at all, or does it simply provide answers to questions people have asked in the past?

If nursing is being taught, how do faculty define that profession? What kind of program will best prepare nurses to still be competent and able twenty or thirty years from now? If faculty are teaching in a community college, are they meeting the needs of the community and, again, how will what they are now teaching students serve them in twenty or thirty years when they are at the peak of their own professional life? These are the kinds of questions which faculty should be asking in

relation to the courses they teach and the curricula they establish.

To say that faculty are accountable in the end for the quality of an institution's curriculum does not mean that faculty are solely responsible for setting it up. It is extremely important that the discussion and decision-making about educational priorities include the central administration, the students, and those in student affairs. It is not simply that the recruiters in the admissions office obviously need to know what the curriculum is and how to describe it when they go out to visit local high schools. Nor is it only that there is a public relations advantage when all employees of an institution of higher education understand its goals and are able to articulate them clearly. It is also that the faculty has something to learn about the curriculum from student affairs personnel. Those who work with and counsel students often have a better sense of the impact of the curriculum as a <u>whole</u> on students than any one individual faculty member, or even the faculty taken collectively. The curriculum's "message," as perceived by a given student generation, is reflected in discussions of course choices, career plans, and financial aid. Good student personnel administrators are alert to perceive the overall effects. They should have the opportunity to report them back accurately to the central administration and the faculty in evaluative discussions. The details of how this is accomplished--with what committees, when and how - varies among institutions.

It is also important that student personnel workers be kept up to date on changes in the curriculum and on the reasoning behind the changes. It is often the people in student affairs who interpret the courses of study to students, clear up misunderstandings, and give advice. If the

institution is to speak to its students in a cohesive way, either the faculty must be as available as the student affairs personnel are, in the student centers, and the advising and counseling offices, or else the faculty must make possible the collaboration of student affairs personnel in the ongoing shaping of the curriculum. At present, students all too often receive conflicting messages, and even incorrect information, because student affairs personnel are too far removed from curricular planning. People trained in student personnel matters are usually good publicists. When
they are well informed on curriculum and educational philosophy, they can also help to reduce the "information gap" which haunts our complex institutions. What good does it do to introduce exciting new programs of study if nobody knows about them?

Another thing which faculty should do is to keep pressure on student affairs personnel to help create an environment conducive to learning. Bombarded daily by students who may learn more easily through physical activity, concrete problem solving, visual sources, meaningful labor, and an introspective grappling with the archetypal existential questions (What can I do well? What do I want from my life? How shall I live? How shall I love? What is there about me that people can love and respect? How can I be effective and render competent service to others?), faculty must "demand" from student affairs personnel a conceptual understanding of student learning needs and technical help in developing flexible repertoires of teaching skills. The student population changes over time, often abruptly. From one academic year to another, faculty suddenly feel that they have lost touch, that the teaching process is not working

properly. Student affairs personnel should be a valuable resource for obtaining an overall picture of students. When an institution, for whatever reason, begins to admit, for example, a larger percentage of non-English speaking students, students from abroad, older students, the handicapped, it is very important that knowledge about the changes be communicated to members of the faculty and that guidance be available for those faculty members who wish it on new ways of reaching out to the new constituencies. People in the student affairs area are often the ones who know the students best. They are--or should be--alert to changes and should even try to anticipate them whenever possible. When recruiting sources change, when--as is now happening in some places--recruiting is being done in retirement homes as well as high schools, in suburban "retread" centers as well as in the armed services, student affairs should be able to anticipate some of the problems that new types of students will bring with them and should assist faculty to prepare themselves in advance. It is also a key role of student affairs to make it possible for students to succeed at an institution once they get there.

Faculty should demand that student affairs personnel sensitize them to the needs, deficits, and strengths of students. Some of the educational deficits of students, are influenced, in part, by prior schooling. Because of their low self-concepts, easy discouragement, initial mistrust of counselors and professors, difficulty in formulating realistic or long-term goals, one basic need of all new learners is to become "institution-wise"--to learn how to deal efficiently and effectively with the convoluted and often inflexible procedures of the academic environment. Any of these deficits could keep students from working to

their highest levels of academic competence. If the deficits and needs are not understood, faculty might unwittingly reinforce a student's low self-image by the ways they respond to a student. Therefore, faculty must ask student affairs personnel to suggest different instructional approaches that build upon the strengths of students rather than accentuate their weaknesses. The years of frustration and failure which many new students experience often leave them unable to succeed in the traditional college classroom. However, with appropriate support, encouragement, and understanding, a student's tendency to expect and fear failure can be reversed.

Now let us turn matters around and see what the professionals in the student affairs area have as educational responsibilities and as expertise to be shared. Student affairs personnel can show faculty how to cultivate their own helping skills. Effective helping begins with the assumption that the total teaching-learning process is rooted in the human interaction between the teacher and the learner. Although most faculty have not had the benefit of human relations or helping skills training in their academic background, they can be assisted in developing such skills. Specific skills useful to faculty might include how to involve students affectively in the classroom, how to be more skillfull questioners and qualifiers, how to listen more empathetically, and how to respond more supportively. No matter what their individual backgrounds and needs, all students desire "wise and compassionate" responses from their teachers. Sadly, the usual training of college instructors only prepares them to be "wise," i.e., knowledgeable about their subject matter.

Student affairs professionals can help faculty develop an awareness of the group dynamics of the classroom. Faculty who understand the basic principles of group dynamics can use this awareness to develop the class as a group. Student affairs personnel can assist on two levels: first there is the possibility of their offering workshops and seminars highlighting the interpersonal dynamics of all learning groups. This might mean helping faculty to understand such technical group constructs as membership characteristics, communication patterns, norms, dominance-submission patterns, discussion ploys, and climate. A second possibility might mean actually working with faculty in their classrooms both as process observers and as group facilitators. Actual classroom assistance requires a three-stage process in which student affairs personnel encourage faculty to develop a conceptual framework for instruction; then they urge them to experiment with specific skills and techniques in their teaching; and finally they evaluate, in a non-supercilious way, the ensuing teaching behaviors and student responses. They also assist faculty in devising their own evaluation systems by encouraging them to develop clear and achievable goals in their teaching which are consistent with their philosophical purposes.

Student affairs personnel can also contribute to the teaching and learning process in another way, if it can be seen as an enhancement of learning rather than an encroachment on faculty territory. Student services personnel are usually the "get it done people" on campus, those who know how to organize and pull off complex events successfully. As faculty work with more and more complex instructional material and approaches, such as, team teaching situations, audiovisual presentations,

televised courses, individualized instruction involving the scheduling of multitudinous small instructional "events" instead of two or three weekly lectures they can make good use of the advice, even the direct assistance, of student affairs personnel who know how to get things done. If faculty members know that the student affairs personnel have their own distinctive educational role and will not try to misuse collaboration, there is much that faculty members can usefully draw on in the expertise available from their student affairs colleagues. In faculty development seminars, why not call on student personnel experts? Why not put the instructor of the introductory political science course in touch with Director of Student Activities to help design the course? If that proposal sounds unthinkable, it is perhaps a measure of the extent to which our roles have become confused and the separation between us unproductive.

There is a more important sense in which student affairs personnel can contribute to the college they serve. One senses in today's university a kind of general tendency toward fragmentation, the force of entropy at work, if you wish. There are disciplines and subdisciplines, and interdisciplinary and crossdisciplinary programs, each actively trying to differentiate itself from the others. There are multiple offices and committees and groups and institutes and programs. On the part of the individual--student, instructor, staff member--there is no sense of mastery over the "whole" which is the university, or even over one's own existence within the whole. In order to gain some feeling of control, people establish territories and isolate themselves within the specialized techniques of their field of interest. As this occurs, who sees to the welfare of the university as a whole? It easily moves more and more in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the direction of being the large bureaucratic "machine" which each person individually is trying to avoid. With the increasing complexity of human knowledge and the increasing faculty specialization which accompanies it, it is easy for the disintegrative tendency to take over. One of the few integrative forces left on campus is student affairs. The student affairs dean, as a generalist, has responsibility for viewing the institution as a whole and interpreting it to students in their individual needs and aspirations.

While others are concerned with their specialties, the student affairs personnel must try to articulate, in every conversation, what the institution is and what it stands for. This happens whether the counselors involved realize it or not. It is in the nature of the many small actions taken as each student makes his or her way through the complexities of the institution. A student comes in to complain of noise in the library and ends up challenging the value of doing twenty calculus problems a night. How the dean or counselor responds affects their view of both themselves and their institution. Student personnel are also people who enjoy bringing groups together, initiating dialogue, organizing separate events into cohesive programs. The university should call upon their skills more often in bringing the institution together and in finding the common threads of unity in the diversity of teaching and scholarship.

Potential Pitfalls in Partnership Between Faculty and Student Affairs Personnel

There are a few caveats which faculty and student affairs personnel might well heed. There are many dangers which could threaten any possible

working partnership between faculty and student affairs personnel.

For the Faculty

Pedagogy is the systematic study of the theory and practice of teaching and learning. Pedagogy underlies all instructional and curricular reform in higher education. It is unfortunate, that over the years, pedagogy has become such an old-fashioned word with pejorative associations for some faculty members. In fact, a convincing case can be made to show that one reason we are presently caught in an instructional morass which threatens to swamp all of higher education is because a generation of "scholars" in higher education has imperiously scoffed at the value of pedagogy in their teaching. It has been too easy for faculty to dismiss pedagogy as the "Mickey Mouse" province of educationalists, or as the mere verbal equivalent of "pedantry." Some faculty still stubbornly refuse to admit the importance of pedagogy, preferring instead to take refuge in the shibboleth that subject matter is valuable for its own sake. Some still cling tenaciously to the belief that the no-nonsense, one-way transmission of information via the lecture method is the best way to penetrate the intellectual defenses of "ignorant" students.

On a philosophical level, there is another danger which could threaten any possible partnership between faculty and student affairs personnel. Why are student affairs personnel, for instance, not perceived by faculty and institutional leaders to be integral participants in the central mission of higher education? A crucial explanation may be found in the "pervasive influence in all its myriad forms of positivist consciousness" (Lucas, 1984, p.22). In the positivist paradigm, dualism represents the

belief that intellectual functioning is independent of affective functioning. The philosophical basis for dualism can be found in the Cartesian split between the mind and the physical realm--the bifurcation of human experience into (a) the internal and subjective and (b) the objective and natural (Lucas 1985). In institutions of higher education, dualism is manifested in the distinctions drawn between intellectual functioning and personal development, the cognitive and the affective, fact and value, and the sciences and the humanities.

Institutions of higher education have created separate but not quite equal structures to accommodate the pervasive notion of a dualistic education. The student affairs division is not engaged in curricular activities. The faculty is responsible for students' acquisition of cognitive skills and learning in the classroom. In this contrived division of labor, the student is treated as a "storage tank" to be filled with facts, and, unfortunately, the integrative experiences required to apply knowledge to moral or social ends is undervalued.

It is not surprising, given the pervasive influence of this positivist belief system, that students' intellectual and personal development are thought to be discrete, mutually exclusive domains. Student affairs work is viewed as ancillary to the primary mission of the academy. The power of this belief system to shape expectations for appropriate behavior and rewards in institutions of higher education should not be underestimated.

By asserting that intellectual activity is always superior to any non-intellectual or irrational behavior, the pervasive positivist belief system presents a formidable barrier to a central role for student affairs. There is a pecking order in American higher education, and

student affairs is not ranked high. Words are powerful shapers of perception, and labels become reality. The predominant words used within the higher education literature to label and describe student affairs work reflect service and support concepts. This language reinforces the belief that student affairs work is not an important part of the educational process. In vain do advocates for student affairs argue for the importance of values, emotions, and personal growth issues and for a holistic perspective of students' development in which the intellect and the affect are psychological domains of equal importance.

As a consequence, many faculty feel that it is too much to ask that they be involved in a holistic approach to student learning. While some have always done it, and with skill and tact, others find the role an imposition. Many of these faculty are, in fact, the loving, democratic, engaged parents who now announce dissatisfaction with the transformations occurring in their classrooms. More than satisfied by their parental duties and styles, they now unselfcounsciously look at their classrooms as the world of business, and to daily classroom transactions as "business as usual." The continuity between family and school, therefore, being demanded by some students, is the very continuity many of these faculty seek to disrupt. Often meeting students' challenges for relevance in course content with a feeling of incredulity, these professors argue that great books and great science <u>are</u> relevant, and besides, that students have all sorts of roommates, boyfriends, girlfriends, advisors, and psychotherapists to "get in touch with." Emotion, therefore, should occupy no place in the classroom.

Accordingly, they ask students to commit what, for certain young

people, is the most fatal of all sins, namely, to compartmentalize relationships and tasks, and begin to recognize that behavior at home or at work will not suffice as appropriate classroom behavior. Such a professor may simply be unsympathetic to the emotional problems of the students. Indeed, he or she may wonder why he or she should be sympathetic at all. What he or she insists upon is that students stop examining themselves and get down to "real" work. Students' inability to complete assignments and seeming disinterest in chosen subject matter exasperate him or her, for he or she is interested not in psychodynamic explanations but in academic results. He or she is there to teach the colonial period, or the nineteenth century novel, or cost-price curves. If students need psychotherapists, they should go to counseling services. No one has yet given him or her an adequate reason for maintaining any continuity between family, work, and the classroom, or convinced him or her, at least for his or her students, such a bridge is necessary.

Tragically, the real point is missed by both students and faculty. What is being sought is some common ground for communication and work. Most likely the kind of emotional support which students need is generally compatible with a relationship between professor and students which many professors would welcome. Students' demand for "understanding" is more often than not an overreaction to a lack of any relationship with faculty at all. In the meantime, faculty are caught in a balancing act. Faculty feel that they must be adroit at knowing how to elicit students' responses to the concepts and data being analyzed in the classroom without having a discussion degenerate into an aimless probing of emotional sensitivities or totally devoid of intellectual insight. Tensions continue because

faculty and students fail to realize that they are both seeking learning environments that satisfy personal needs.

There are hopeful signs that faculty are ready for instructional reform. At a time when many young people are questioning the value of higher education, either by staying away from the university in droves, or by enrolling with diminishing enthusiasm in occupational programs, thus abandoning the arts and humanities; and when the general public is urging massive financial cutbacks to higher education as an expression of their waning faith in the occupational usefulness of higher learning; and when many faculty are suffering from the most acute kinds of identity crises due to the sudden downswing in the prestige of scholarly research and publication and the upswing in the demand for instructional performance, most faculty are opening up to an "adaptive curriculum," one that converts didactic classroom teaching styles to humanistic procedures.

For the Student Affairs Professional

What are the pitfalls that student affairs personnel must be wary of? The student affairs professional must be wary of conveying to faculty (who tend to be critical of excessiveness in any form) an obsession with a student's deeper levels of feelings and attitudes to the total denigration of the intellect as a valuable way of knowing. They must also guard against a naive rejection of the power of environmental, historical, and even genetic processes in shaping the students' behaviors. Nothing will alienate faculty more quickly than a blithe disregard for social and historical realities and their influence on student values and academic performance. Closely related to this issue is the tendency of some student affairs professionals to freeze their probing at the

phenomenological level of "navel-gazing" and "self-analysis," thus denying the need for the social action necessary to create a world where self-analysis can occur in the first place. Finally, when student affairs professionals either consciously or unconsciously repudiate the importance of basic intellectual skills, they forget the Maslowian insight that intellectual competence is a basic human need, necessary for self-esteem, and fundamental to further growth toward self-actualization.

On a more practical level, they must be conscious of the temptation to use excessive jargon in dealings with faculty. Consultants in all fields sometimes unknowingly blunt the potential impact of their interventions by using highly technical and refined language which the consultee simply does not understand. They need to monitor constantly the language they are using, and be sensitive at all times to the reactions of their clients. They must accept the real possibility that in order to be persuasive to faculty who are sometimes critical of their academic backgrounds, they devise an arcane technical language as a defense. If their advice is worthwhile, it can and must be given in simple and direct language.

Another danger is the tendency of many "experts" to be insensitive to the development needs of the <u>professional</u> clients they are serving. If it is true that every person has a need to feel competent at what he or she does, then this is especially true of the faculty whose principal occupational reward is <u>intrinsic</u> psychic meaning and satisfaction. This awareness entails their avoiding a "this is what you are doing wrong" approach and using instead a gambit which starts with the strengths of the instructor. They must begin forthwith to engage faculty as sensitively as

they encourage faculty to deal with students; in this way, they become consistent living models of the humanistic philosophy they espouse.

Another pitfall involves their subscribing to what Maslow calls the "psychoanalytic myth" - the belief that insight is all that is needed to produce behavioral change. Too many consultants feel that their task is completed once they deliver their "expert" diagnosis of a situation. This diagnosis, usually presented in dazzling jargon, is then held to be so erudite and accurate that all that remains is for the client to choose to change self-defeating behaviors and beliefs. Much of what students report they learn the most from and is of most value to them has been experienced in small groups with their peers. Change does not occur by "appointment" in a one-to-one interaction with a student affairs professional. Experiences that are likely to bring about change involve group peer interaction in class. Research in the dynamics of behavior change demonstrates that such change is not likely to occur through lengthy and agonizing period of reappraisal of the past. Modification of long-entrenched patterns of thinking and behaving occurs under the uncompromising scrutiny and warm support of caring peers (Fried, 1980). Change belongs to the client, not the expert. It cannot be stressed enough that student affairs professionals must be ever sensitive to an instructor's need for dignity and professional competence. It is almost axiomatic that faculty will not alter their pedagogy without their patient support and understanding.

Support and understanding are never conveyed by haughtiness. Some instructional experts have been known to approach their clients with the smugness of those who possess the "holy grail" of methodology, and with

the self-righteousness of those who have been to the mountain (the latest workshop) to receive the "TQM commandment" forever etched in stone. Usually, this type of sanctimonious zeal is a mask for incompetence, personal insecurity, and a need to avoid face-to-face challenges of professional opinions. The antidote to a "know-it-all" professionalism is for student affairs personnel to present as undogmatically as possible their observations of an instructor's performance; it should go without saying that these observations must always be grounded in rational, clear, and convincing criteria of what constitutes instructional effectiveness. In addition, we must respond without unnecessary defensiveness to questions and criticisms, even when these smack of vindictiveness or "sour grapes." The approach should always be: "Here are some possible ways that you might help your students learn that you might not have considered. If I can be of further help, please call on me. Perhaps we can try some new things together."

All of these potential problems speak to the need for student affairs professionals to exemplify the humanism they profess. These warnings also are reminders for them to transfer the interpersonal and counseling skills they have honed in student personnel training to their new role. The sine qua non for the co-equal partnership being advocated must be mutual respect, and because few faculty are likely to give their trust gratuitously to an "outsider," they must always be more tentative in their helpfulness than certain, more patient and plodding than aggressive. At the outset, their relationships must be characterized by their persistently trying to see the teacher-learning situation as faculty see it. Initially, this may even require their avoiding some larger

philosophical debates in response to a remark like the following: "John is not college material!" Any ensuing discussion must be centered on the fact that John is indeed in the teacher's classroom, and both of them have vested interests (one personal, the other professional) in helping him to grow. With this tact, they are furthering the case for the student without directly estranging the faculty member. They are also creating the possibility that even a modicum of success by the student could change the teacher's attitude, no matter how intractable it might at first appear.

These are some of the caveats that student affairs professionals must take into account before forging a co-equal partnership in educating students. The important thing is that members of the faculty, on the one hand, and student affairs people, on the other, must preserve their unique educational point of view, recognizing its identity and its worth. The dialectic, the tension between opposites, is a creative and useful dynamic within an institution. Student affairs people need not become more technically expert. They do need to possess identifiable skills and to be articulate apologists for higher education as a whole. Faculty members need not become more managerial and hail-fellow-well-met. They do need to be responsible, humane, and independent in working with their students and their course material. The identity of student affairs must be asserted and fostered rather than denied. Faculty need to recognize the legitimacy of non-faculty roles in today's complex colleges and universities, while student affairs administrators need to respect the faculty's specialized educational mission.

Guskin (1994) challenged our colleges and universities, now that they

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are relieved of the burden of expansion, to concentrate on the quality of education. He echoes what voices within the higher education community have been saying. One way to improve the quality of the college experience, without spending more money, is to recognize the complementarities of style and skill which faculty and student affairs personnel bring to their work with students, so as to use everyone's talents more fully. Together, faculty and student affairs people can do more for the quality of education than they can accomplish separately. This is clear from the conclusions Alexander Astin (1978) reaches in his study of the effects of college-going, Four Critical Years. He repeats several times that the positive and lasting effects of a college education are in direct proportion to the level of involvement of students with their education. The factors which he finds most powerful in encouraging involvement are, first, interaction with faculty, both in the classroom and beyond it, and, second, involvement in the life of the campus through part-time work, research projects, athletics, and student activities. Involvement cuts right across the lines of formal and informal learning, just as our joint effort should do. All of us who share responsibility for students must find ways to join and blend our distinctive skills.

In Blackberry Winter, Margaret Mead gives her many admirers a lively account of her earlier years. She describes her eager anticipation of going to college, "I approached the idea of college with the expectation of taking part in an intellectual feast," she says, and adds, "In college, in some way that I devoutly believed in but could not explain, I expected to become a person." There we have it: development as a mind and as a person, fulfillment and transformation. Her first college year went

badly, but then, at Barnard College in New York, she found the combination of classroom and context, of intellectual feast and personal development, that met her expectations. The Barnard chapter of the book almost overflows with the activities she got into, the close friends she made, the excitement of finding her career "home" in anthropology. "In the autumn of 1920," she states simply, "I came to Barnard, where I found - and in some measure created - the kind of student life that matched my earlier dreams" (Mead, 1972, pp. 90 and 102, and the chapter between).

There is a larger and more varied population with college dreams today than in 1920. Not everyone conceives an intellectual feast in the same terms as Margaret Mead, but every prospective student I have talked with wants, and expects, intellectual and personal challenges out of the college experience. Will the life of our campus - curricular and co-curricular - match the highest dreams of those who come to us? What kinds of learning, formal and informal, will they be able to achieve? As faculty members and as student affairs personnel, let us prepare <u>together</u> a good intellectual feast, a powerful transforming experience, so that future Margaret Meads, or Joe Smiths, or Maria Garcias, can find "and in some measure create" an education that will be the pride of all of us.

References

Astin, A. W. (1978). Four critical years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fried, E. (1980). The courage to change. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Inc.

Guskin, A. E. (1994). Restructuring the role of faculty. Change, 26(5), 16-25.

Hofstadter, R. (1983). Anti-intellectualism in American life. New York: Knopf.

Joyce, J. (1976). A portrait of the artist as a young man. New York: Penguin.

Light, R. J. (1992). The Harvard Assessment Seminars: Explorations with Students and Faculty about Teaching, Learning, and Student Life (second report). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Graduate School of Education and Kennedy School of Government.

Lucas, C. J. (1985). Out at the edge: Notes on a paradigm shift. Journal of Counseling and Development, 64, 165-172.

_____. (1984). Liberal learning and the humanities: A reaffirmation. Journal of General Education, 36, 20-31.

Mead, M. (1972). Blackberry Winter: My Earlier Years. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Mintzberg, H. (1975). The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact. Harvard Business Review, 53, 49-61.

Polyani, M. (1981). Knowing and Being. Mind, 70, 458-470.

Sheehy, G. (1976). Passages: predictable crises of adult life. New York: Dutton.

Stroup, H. (1979). Theoretical constructs in student personnel work. The Journal of Higher Education, 50(4), 527-534.